



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ORANGEBURG DIVISION**

|                            |   |                              |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| 318 ROYAL STREET LLC,      | § |                              |
| Plaintiff,                 | § |                              |
|                            | § |                              |
| vs.                        | § |                              |
|                            | § | CIVIL ACTION 5:21-32-MGL-SVH |
| DESTINY NATASHA THOMAS and | § |                              |
| MANLETO SHAMAR THOMAS,     | § |                              |
| Defendants.                | § |                              |

---

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND REMANDING THIS MATTER  
TO THE ORANGEBURG COUNTY MAGISTRATE COURT**

---

Defendants Destiny Natasha Thomas and Manleto Shamar Thomas (the Thomases), proceeding pro se, removed this rent/eviction case to the Court from the Orangeburg County Magistrate Court. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting the matter be remanded to the Orangeburg County Magistrate Court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may

accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on January 7, 2021, but the Thomases failed to file any objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this matter is **REMANDED** to the Orangeburg County Magistrate Court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 27h day of January, 2021, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis  
MARY GEIGER LEWIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.